

REMARKS

This amendment responds to the Final Office Action mailed January 11, 2006. In the office action, the Examiner

- allowed claims 1-6, 41 and 42; and
- rejected claims 7-12, 14-20, 22-25, 27-33, 35-38 and 40 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Langsenkamp (US 5,912,947) in view of Zirngibl et al. (US 6,798,867).

After entry of this amendment, the pending claims are: claims 1-10, 12, 14-20, 22-23, 25, 27-33, 35-36, 38 and 40-42. Claims 11, 13, 21, 24, 26, 34, 37 and 39 have been canceled.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

During the March 2, 2006 interview with the Examiner, Applicants pointed out that the password in Langsenkamp is not message-specific, but callee-specific. The paragraph (col. 21, lines 61-67) of Langsenkamp merely provides a rationale for the reason to password protect the messages received by the callee. All different types of messages directed to the callee share the same password. In contrast, two different messages in the present application may have distinct passcodes even if they are delivered to the same recipient. Therefore, the passcode of the present application is indeed message-specific.

In order to expedite the prosecution of the present application, Applicants proposed to amend all the rejected independent claims to describe that the message-specific passcode is specified by the first user, who is also the author of the voice organizer message. In contrast, the callee in Langsenkamp is not the author of the messages, but the recipient of the messages. This amendment further differentiates the pending claims from Langsenkamp. The Examiner agreed with Applicants' interpretation and the amendment proposal. Applicants also agreed to cancel claims 11, 24 and 37.

CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Claim 7 has been amended to further describe that the message-specific passcode is specified by the first user, who records the voice organizer message. The setup, modification and usage of the message-specific passcode are discussed in detail in the present application (see, e.g., page 5, line 1– page 6, line 25 in connection with FIGS. 4-6).

As shown in FIG. 4, when the first user creates a new voice organizer message, he may choose to specify a message-specific passcode at step 410. In other words, the first user is responsible for not only creating the message but also associating a passcode with the message. The first user can also modify the message-specific passcode at step 508 of FIG. 5 if he chooses to do so. Therefore, the creation of the message-specific passcode is controlled by the first user.

By contrast, the second user, i.e., the recipient of the voice organizer message, has no control over the creation of the passcode. When the message is delivered to the second user, he will be prompted to enter the passcode (step 610 of FIG. 6). Once the passcode entered by the second user is verified to be correct (step 612 of FIG. 6), the message will be played to the second user (step 614 of FIG. 6). Therefore, the second user cannot determine what passcode should be associated with the voice organizer message.

Claims 12, 15, 25, 28 and 38 have been amended accordingly.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner argued that the password in Langsenkamp is message-specific, not callee-specific. Applicants respectfully disagree.

In col. 18, lines 37-45, Langsenkamp teaches that

“Upon installation of the system, it may be desirable to communicate with all potential callees to **allow each callee to configure the system** for that callee for all future calls. Such configuration may include calling times, the invocation of a password so that the callee is certain that a particular individuals or set of individuals receive messages from the system (**a callee may desire such a feature to prevent messages from being heard or intercepted by children**, for example), or limiting the types of messages the callee will receive.”

During account configuration in Langsenkamp, the callee sets up a password for the future calls directed to the callee. The password is callee-specific, not message-specific. Langsenkamp does not teach or indicate that different types of messages received by the callee will be associated with different passwords. Rather, all the messages received by the callee will be associated with the same password provided by the callee.

With this amendment, Applicants have amended independent claims 7, 12, 15, 25, 28 and 38 to recite that it is the first user who specifies the message-specific passcode. This amendment further differentiates the present application from Langsenkamp. According to Langsenkamp, the callee is the recipient of the messages and the creator of the password.

The callee may use the password to prevent others (e.g., children) from hearing the messages (e.g., if the messages are related to sex-offenders). In the present application, the second user of claim 7 (i.e., the recipient of the messages) is not the creator of the message-specific passcode. Rather, it is the first user (i.e., the creator of the messages) who is responsible for specifying a message-specific passcode.


In sum, since Langsenkamp and Zirngibl, alone or in combination, have not taught all the features of claims 7, 12, 15, 25, 28 and 38, as amended, all pending claims are patentable over Langsenkamp in view of Zirngibl.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider this application with a view towards allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at 650-843-7501, if a telephone call could help resolve any remaining items.

Date: March 10, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



Gary S. Williams

31,066
(Reg. No.)

Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
2 Palo Alto Square
3000 El Camino Real, Suite 700
Palo Alto, California 94306
(650) 843-4000